APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/622,360	07/17/2003	Wolfgang Kalthoff	2058.213US1	5356

50400   7590   11/12/2008
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER/SAP
P.O. BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER
DAILEY, THOMAS J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2452	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/12/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _05 August 2008_.

2a)☒ This action is FINAL.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1,5,6 and 12-87_ is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1, 5-6, and 12-87_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 5-6, and 12-87 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. The applicant's entered amendments have alleviated the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, rejections of claims 5, 12-17, 19, 37-29, 41-58, 60-70, 72-79, and 83-87, and those rejections have been withdrawn.

3. Applicant's arguments filed August 5, 2008 with respect to the prior art rejections of the claims have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

4. The applicant argues with respect to the independent claims that the combination of Carter (US Pat. 5,418,945) fails to disclose or suggest the specific type of a data set recited in claim 1 that includes both locked and unlocked data - namely, "a stored data set maintained by a first entity of a computer system to include a locked data set and an unlocked data set, the stored data set being stored in memory, the unlocked data set being available for modification and the locked data set being protected from modification." The applicant further contends Hurvig (US Pat. 5,418,945), even if combined with Carter, also fails to disclose or suggest the specific type of a data set recited in claim 1 that includes both locked and unlocked data. Asserting, the combination of Carter and Hurvig does not teach "a stored data set maintained by a first entity of a computer system to

include a locked data set and an unlocked data set, the stored data set being

stored in memory, the unlocked data set being available for modification and the

locked data set being protected from modification."

5. The examiner disagrees.   In response to applicant's arguments against the

references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking

references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of

references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re*

Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Specifically, **Carter discloses** transmitting a locked data set to a second

entity (column 5, lines 18-26) and reversing the locked data set at the second

entity, such that the locked data set becomes an unlocked data set being

available for modification (column 5, lines 18-26, client checks out file group for

alteration, i.e. it can alter the file group that is locked by the server) and **Hurvig**

discloses a stored data set including an unlocked data set being available for

modification (Fig 4, label 208, server stores modifiable database), transmitting

the unlocked data set to a second entity (column 9, lines 14-24, file stored in

database is transmitted), and reversing the unlocked data set at the second

entity such that the unlocked data set becomes a locked data set being protected

from modification (column 9, lines 14-24, if a process is given read-only access

to a transmitted, this reads on a reversal of the unlocked data, as the file was

modifiable at the server, but when stored at the remote process the file can only

be read).

Therefore, to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, the

combination of Carter and Hurvig would disclose a stored data set including both

unlocked and locked data sets, because to one of ordinary skill in the art "a

stored data set" may include differing types of data (e.g. unlocked and locked

data given Carter's and Hurvig's teachings) and simply combining the two data

sets into one was a known technique and would have yielded predictable results.

Further, transmitting and then reversing the locked and unlocked data sets would

also have been disclosed by the combination of Carter and Hurvig by the same

logic, see above citations.

Additionally, the combination of Carter and Hurvig would have been obvious

as a person of ordinary skill the art has good reason to pursue the known options

within his or her technical grasp (combining Carter's locked data set with Hurvig's

unlocked data set) and if this leads to anticipated success, it is likely the product

not of innovation, but of ordinary skill and common sense.

6. The applicant further argues, the Office action discussed, in the rejection of the

independent claims with Carter in view of Hurvig, transmitting only the locked

data set to the first entity and transmitting only the unlocked data set to the first

entity, but did not discuss the operation recited in independent claims -

"transmitting the locked data set and the unlocked data set to a second entity,"

where the locked data set and the unlocked data set are both included in the

same data set. Further contending the combination of Carter and Hurvig do not

disclose the "reversing" recited in the independent claims.

7. The examiner disagrees. As elaborated on above, to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention, the combination of Carter and Hurvig would

disclose a stored data set including both unlocked and locked data sets, because

to one of ordinary skill in the art "a stored data set" may include differing types of

data (i.e. unlocked and locked data given Carter's and Hurvig's teachings) and

simply combining the two data sets into one was a known technique and would

have yielded predictable results. Further, transmitting and then reversing the

locked and unlocked data sets would also have been disclosed by the

combination of Carter and Hurvig by the same logic, because **Carter discloses**

transmitting a locked data set to a second entity (column 5, lines 18-26) and

reversing the locked data set at the second entity, such that the locked data set

becomes an unlocked data set being available for modification (column 5, lines

18-26, client checks out file group for alteration, i.e. it can alter the file group that

is locked by the server) and **Hurvig discloses** a stored data set including an

unlocked data set being available for modification (Fig 4, label 208, server stores

modifiable database), transmitting the unlocked data set to a second entity

(column 9, lines 14-24, file stored in database is transmitted), and reversing the

unlocked data set at the second entity such that the unlocked data set becomes

a locked data set being protected from modification (column 9, lines 14-24, if a

process is given read-only access to a transmitted, this reads on a reversal of the

unlocked data, as the file was modifiable at the server, but when stored at the

remote process the file can only be read).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1, 5, 15-18, 20-30, 33--34, 36-37, 39-50, 55-57, 59-69, 71-72, 74-75, and

77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter et al.

(US Pat. 5,418,945), hereafter "Carter," in view of Hurvig (US Pat. 5,628,005).

10. As to claim 1, Carter discloses a computer implemented method of sharing

information, comprising:

defining a stored data set maintained by a first entity of computer system

(column 3, lines 52-57) to include a locked data set, the stored data set being

stored in memory, and the locked data set being protected from modification

(column 5, lines 18-26, file group is locked when checked out by a client);

transmitting the locked data set to a second entity (column 5, lines 18-26); and

reversing the locked data set at the second entity, such that the locked data set becomes an unlocked data set being available for modification (column 5, lines 18-26, client checks out file group for alteration, i.e. it can alter the file group that is locked by the server).

But, Carter does not explicitly disclose the stored data set including an unlocked data set being available for modification, transmitting the unlocked data set to a second entity, and reversing the unlocked data set at the second entity such that the unlocked data set becomes a locked data set being protected from modification.

However, Hurvig discloses a stored data set including an unlocked data set being available for modification (Fig 4, label 208, server stores modifiable database), transmitting the unlocked data set to a second entity (column 9, lines 14-24, file stored in database is transmitted), and reversing the unlocked data set at the second entity such that the unlocked data set becomes a locked data set being protected from modification (column 9, lines 14-24, if a process is given read-only access to a transmitted, this reads on a reversal of the unlocked data, as the file was modifiable at the server, but when stored at the remote process the file can only be read).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Carter and Hurvig in order to create a more robust and flexible file permission management system by utilizing the teachings of Hurvig to grant read-only permissions to subsets of the master file group of Carter.

11. As to claim 20, Carter discloses a computer-implemented method of sharing information, comprising:

defining a master data set in a first entity of a computer system, the master data set being stored in memory (column 3, lines 52-57);

assigning permissions, including permission to change a first subset of data within the master data set based on predetermined criteria, the permissions indicating operations that a second entity may perform on the first subset data and applications that the second entity may use for manipulating the first sub set of data (column 4, lines 52-58, permissions are assigned using password lists, one such password list being "a write password list");

transmitting a copy of the master data set with indications of the permissions to the second entity, the transmitted copy of the master data set including unlocked data (column 5, lines 18-26, requesting given indications of permission via the security means as disclosed in column 4, lines 52-58), and the unlocked data in the received copy of the master data set corresponding to locked data in

the master data set in the first entity (column 5, lines 18-26, file group is locked

when checked out by a client for alteration); and

receiving a manipulated master data set in accordance with the assigned

permissions from the second entity, the manipulated master data set including a

second subset of data resulting from a first subset of data being manipulated by

the second entity using one or more of the operations indicated in the

permissions (column 5, lines 38-45, the client updates the master file group after

it is finished working with it).

But, Carter does not explicitly disclose the transmitted copy of the master

data set including locked data, the locked data in the received copy of the master

data set corresponding to unlocked data in the master data set in the first entity.

However, Hurvig discloses a stored data set including an unlocked data set

being available for modification (Fig 4, label 208, server stores modifiable

database), transmitting the unlocked data set to a second entity (column 9, lines

14-24, file stored in database is transmitted), and reversing the unlocked data set

at the second entity such that the unlocked data set becomes a locked data set

being protected from modification (column 9, lines 14-24, if a process is given

read-only access to a transmitted, this reads on a reversal of the unlocked data,

as the file was modifiable at the server, but when stored at the remote process

the file can only be read).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Carter and Hurvig in order to create a more robust and flexible file permission management system by utilizing the teachings of Hurvig to grant read-only permissions to subsets of the master file group of Carter.

12. As to claim 33, Carter discloses a computer-implemented method of sharing information comprising:

receiving, from a first entity of a computer system, a copy of a master data set, the master data set including locked data and being stored in memory (column 5, lines 18-26, file group is locked when checked out for alteration), the received copy of the master data set including unlocked data, the unlocked data in the received copy of the master data set corresponding to the locked data in the master data set (column 5, lines 18-26, the client which has checked out the file group can alter the locked data);

modifying the copy of the master data set (column 4, lines 29-33 and column 5, lines 38-45); and

transmitting the modified copy of the master data set to the first entity (column 5, lines 38-45).

But, Carter does not explicitly disclose the transmitted copy of the master data set including locked data, the locked data in the received copy of the master data set corresponding to unlocked data in the master data set in the first entity.

However, Hurvig discloses a stored data set including an unlocked data set being available for modification (Fig 4, label 208, server stores modifiable database), transmitting the unlocked data set to a second entity (column 9, lines 14-24, file stored in database is transmitted), and reversing the unlocked data set at the second entity such that the unlocked data set becomes a locked data set being protected from modification (column 9, lines 14-24, if a process is given read-only access to a transmitted, this reads on a reversal of the unlocked data, as the file was modifiable at the server, but when stored at the remote process the file can only be read).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Carter and Hurvig in order to create a more robust and flexible file permission management system by utilizing the teachings of Hurvig to grant read-only permissions to subsets of the master file group of Carter.

13. As to claim 40, it is rejected by the same rationale set forth in claim 1's rejection.

14. As to claim 59, it is rejected by the same rationale set forth in claim 59's
    rejection.

15. As to claim 71, it is rejected by the same rationale set forth in claim 33's
    rejection.

16. As to claims 5 and 44, Carter and Hurvig disclose defining the locked data set to
    include information to call an application (Carter, column 3, lines 52-57,
    databases store application related data) and the unlocked data set to include
    data to be used by an application (Hurvig, column 9, lines 14-24, files are used
    by an application).

17. As to claims 15 and 54, Carter discloses assigning data in the stored data set to
    the locked data set and the unlocked data set based on a function of the second
    entity (column 4, lines 52-58, permission is based on function, either access or
    write functionality).

18. As to claims 16 and 55, Carter discloses defining data included in the unlocked
    data set for the second entity as locked for other entities (column 5, lines 21-26).

19. As to claims 17 and 56, Carter discloses defining data included in the unlocked
    data set for the second entity as locked for all other entities during a period of

time when the second entity has access to the unlocked data set (column 5, lines
21-26).

20. As to claims 18 and 57, Carter discloses:

receiving modified data from the second entity (column 5, lines 38-45); and

integrating the modified data into the stored data set (column 5, lines 38-45).

21. As to claims 21 and 60, Carter discloses receiving a modified copy of the master
data set from the second entity and integrating the modified copy of the master
data set with the master data set (column 5, lines 38-45).

22. As to claims 22 and 61, Carter discloses receiving the modified copy of the
master data set includes receiving additional data (column 4, lines 29-33, the
editor on the client can "create new files," which will then be sent back as
discloses in column 5, lines 38-45).

23. As to claims 23 and 62, Carter discloses receiving the modified copy of the
master data set includes receiving changed data (column 4, lines 29-33 and
column 5, lines 38-45).

24. As to claims 24 and 63, Carter discloses receiving changed data includes
    receiving data that has been changed in response to design considerations
    (column 4, lines 29-33 and column 5, lines 38-45).

25. As to claims 25 and 64, Carter discloses assigning permissions includes
    assigning authority to read data (column 4, lines 52-58, access password list
    reads on "authority to read data").

26. As to claims 26 and 65, Carter discloses assigning permissions includes
    assigning authority to change data that is a subset of the transmitted copy of the
    master data (column 52-58).

27. As to claims 27 and 66, Carter discloses assigning permissions includes
    assigning authority to add data (column 4, lines 29-33 and column 4, lines 52-
    58).

28. As to claims 28 and 67, Carter discloses assigning permissions includes
    assigning authority to delete data (column 4, lines 29-33 and column 4, lines 52-
    58).

29. As to claims 29 and 68, Carter discloses assigning permissions includes

    assigning authority to access predetermined types of data within the subset

    (column 4, lines 52-58).

30. As to claims 30 and 69, Carter discloses assigning permissions includes

    assigning permissions based on at least one of an identity of an entity, a function

    of the entity (column 4, lines 52-58, permission is based on function, either

    access or write functionality) and a user's position within the entity.

31. As to claims 34, 41, and 72, Carter discloses receiving the copy of the master

    data set in a second entity includes receiving the copy of the master data set in a

    computer application (column 4, lines 6-11, the client computer system (the

    second entity) runs a client (an application) that has access to the data).

32. As to claims 36 and 74, Carter discloses performing design processes on the

    unlocked portion of the data (column 4, lines 29-33).

33. As to claims 37 and 75, Carter discloses receiving permissions to do at least one

    of read, change, delete and add data to the unlocked data (column 4, lines 52-

    58).

34. As to claims 39 and 77, Carter discloses receiving the copy of the master data
    set with permissions based on at least one of an identity of the second entity
    (column 4, lines 52-58), a function of the second entity and a hierarchy of users
    within the second entity.

35. As to claim 42, Carter discloses providing an application maintained at a location
    external to the first entity with access to the stored data set (column 4, lines 6-11,
    the client system is remote from the servers storing the master databases).

36. As to claim 43, Carter discloses providing a computer aided design system with
    access to the stored data set (column 4, lines 6-11 and column 4, lines 25-33).

37. As to claim 46, Carter discloses sending the stored data set to the second entity
    (column 4, lines 25-33).

38. As to claim 47, Hurvig discloses providing the first entity with access to the stored
    data set, the first entity having permission to view the unlocked data set and to
    change only the locked data set (column 9, lines 14-24).

39. As to claim 48, Carter discloses providing a computer aided design system with
    access to the stored data set (column 4, lines 6-11 and column 4, lines 25-33).

40. As to claim 49, Carter discloses providing a second entity with access includes
   providing an entity that is external to the first entity with access to the stored data
   set (column 4, lines 4-11).

41. As to claim 50, Carter and Hurvig disclose assigning data in the stored data set
   to the locked data set and an unlocked data set based on predetermined criteria
   (Carter, column 4, lines 52-58 and Hurvig, column 9, lines 10-18)).

42. Claims 12-14, 19, 31-32, 38, 51-53, 58, 70, and 76 are rejected under 35
   U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter and Hurvig in view of Fabbio
   (US Pat. 5,335,346).

43. As to claims 12 and 51, Carter and Hurvig do not disclose defining the stored
   data set to include a restricted data set including data that is not part of the
   locked data set or the unlocked data set.
       However, Fabbio discloses defining the stored data set that includes locked
   and unlocked data sets to further include a restricted data set including data that
   is not part of the locked data set or the unlocked data set (column 3, lines 27-31,
   readable objects read on "unlocked data," writeable objects read on "locked
   data," executable objects read on "restricted data.")
       Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the
   time of the invention to combine the teachings of Carter and Hurvig with Fabbio

in order to allow the file permission management system greater flexibility in how it classifies data.

44. As to claims 13-14 and 52-53, Carter and Hurvig do not disclose assigning data to the locked data set based on closeness criteria includes assigning data to the locked data set based on at least one of geometric closeness, organizational closeness.

   However, Fabbio discloses assigning data to the locked data set based on closeness criteria includes assigning data to the locked data set based on at least one of geometric closeness, organizational closeness (column 3, line 64– column 4, line 1, it is inherent that the grouping of "group ids" will be according to organizational closeness in any network, and collective closeness)

   Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Carter and Hurvig with Fabbio in order to allow the file permission management system greater flexibility in how it classifies data.

45. As to claims 19 and 58, Carter and Hurvig do not explicitly disclose defining the stored data set to include a locked data set and an unlocked data set based on user input.

However, Fabbio discloses defining the stored data set to include a locked data set and an unlocked data set based on user input (Fig. 9A, labels 901 and 903).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Carter and Hurvig with Fabbio in order to allow a user to have direct control of data classification.

46. As to claims 31 and 70, Carter and Hurvig do not explicitly assigning permissions according to a hierarchy within the second entity so that a highest ranking member of an entity has a greater number of permissions, and a number and extent of permissions decrease as rank decreases.

However, Fabbio discloses assigning permissions according to a hierarchy within the second entity so that a highest ranking member of an entity has a greater number of permissions, and a number and extent of permissions decrease as rank decreases (column 9, lines 22-32, Fabbio system includes administration rights and that, inherently has a hierarchical structure).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Carter and Hurvig with Fabbio in order to allow the file permission management system greater flexibility in how it classifies data.

47. As to claims 32, 38 and 76, Carter and Hurvig do not disclose different

permissions assigned for different subsets of the unlocked data

However, Fabbio discloses different permissions assigned for different

subsets of the unlocked data (column 3, lines 27-31 and column 8, lines 9-19).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to combine the teachings of Carter and Hurvig with Fabbio

in order to allow the file permission management system greater flexibility in how

it classifies data.

48. Claims 6, 35, 45, 73, 78-87, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Carter in view of Hurvig, as applied to claims 1, 20, 33, 40, 59,

and 71, in further view of Sweeney et al (US Pat. 5,966,715), hereafter

"Sweeney."

49. As to claims 6, 35, 45, and 73, Carter and Hurvig do not disclose defining version

data for an application as the locked data set and defining raw data for the

second entity to look at or use as the unlocked data. Rather, neither teaching

getsinto specifics in regards to what the data sets comprise.

However, Sweeney discloses defining version data for an application as the

locked data set and defining raw data for the second entity to look at or use as

the unlocked data (column 8, line 66-column 9, line 15, the Version Control

Manager has access (read only) to the version information (locked data or
version data) and the rest of an application (unlocked data or raw data) can be
executed or modified).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the
time of the invention to combine the teachings of Carter and Hurvig with the
teaching of Sweeney in order to give have the data represent something specific
such as in version information which was disclosed in Sweeney.

50. As to claim 78 and 83, Carter and Hurvig do not disclose providing an application
in a computer system with access to the stored data set includes providing a
testing application with access to the stored data set.

However, Sweeney discloses providing an application in a computer system
with access to the stored data set includes providing a testing application with
access to the stored data set (column 12, lines 16-29, Sweeney's system
includes means to test the databases and programs).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the
time of the invention to combine the teachings of Carter and Sweeney in order to
give Carter's system a specific function, such as the ability to test the
applications.

51. As to claims 79 and 84, they are rejected by the same rationale set forth in claim
78's rejection.

52. As to claims 80 and 85, Carter and Hurvig does not disclose receiving additional
data includes receiving test results. Rather, Carter's additional data is generic
and it does not specifically disclose the additional data's contents.

However, Sweeney discloses receiving additional data includes receiving test
results (column 12, lines 16-29, the application is tested and new data is added
to it and distributed to users). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of
ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of
Carter and Hurvig with Sweeney in order to give Carter's system a specific
function, such as the ability to test the applications.

53. As to claims 81 and 86, Carter and Hurvig does not disclose receiving changed
data includes receiving data that has been changed in response to testing.

However, Sweeney discloses receiving changed data includes receiving data
that has been changed in response to testing (column 12, lines 16-29, the
application is tested and new data is added to it and distributed to users).
Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time
of the invention to combine the teachings of Carter and Hurvig with Sweeney in

order to give Carter's system a specific function, such as the ability to test the

applications.

54. As to claims 82 and 87, Carter and Hurvig do not disclose modifying the copy of

the master data set includes performing testing on the unlocked portion of the

data.

However, Sweeney discloses modifying the copy of the master data set

includes performing testing on the unlocked portion of the data (column 12, lines

16-29, the application is tested and new data is added to it and distributed to

users).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to combine the teachings of Carter and Hurvig with the

teaching of Sweeney in order to give Carter's system a specific function, such as

the ability to test the applications.

Conclusion

55. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

56. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed

within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory

action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory

period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory

action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

57. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Dailey whose telephone number is

571-270-1246. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday;

9:00am - 5:00pm.

58. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is

571-273-8300.

59. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR

only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-

9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/T. J. D./
Examiner, Art Unit 2452

/Kenny S Lin/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2452